Interview Summary	10/699,987	CHO, WING-KEE PHILIP
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Humera N. Sheikh	1615
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Humera N. Sheikh</u> .	personnel): (3) Barry Jacobsen	19.
(2) Natalie M. Derzko.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>12 March 2009</u> .		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2	2)⊠ applicant's representative	e]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: of record.		
Identification of prior art discussed: Aberg et al. (USPN 5,731,319); Hellberg et al. (USPN 6,372,802).		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
Patential Claim Amandments Were	discussed. Applica	ant indicated
the normal reference of Aberg does not teach the "tree base form"		
of design toline. Applicant m	ay file KC .	Appl. Serve
response will be reviewed for the determination of allowable		
subject matter.		

Application No.

Applicant(s)

/Humera N. Sheikh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615